UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

HOUSTON DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, . CASE NO. 4:22-CR-577-8 . CASE NO. 4:22-MJ-2398-05

PLAINTIFF,

HOUSTON, TEXAS **v**.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2022

EMERY GOODLEY 01:31 P.M. TO 02:28 P.M.

DEFENDANT.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION/DETENTION HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE SAM S. SHELDON UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES: SEE NEXT PAGE

ELECTRONIC RECORDING OFFICER: MAYRA M. MARQUEZ

CASE MANAGER: SHANNON JONES

OFFICIAL INTERPETER: NONE PRESENT

TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE BY:

TRINITY TRANSCRIPTION SERVICES 1081 Main Street Surgoinsville, TN 37873 281-782-0802 battshott@aol.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; Transcript produced by transcription service.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

HOUSTON DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, . CASE NO. 4:22-CR-577-8 . CASE NO. 4:22-MJ-2398-05 PLAINTIFF, HOUSTON, TEXAS ٧. THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2022 EMERY GOODLEY 01:31 P.M. TO 02:28 P.M. DEFENDANT. CASE NO. 4:22-MJ-2398-02 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF, ٧. MARKEL BROWN, DEFENDANT. . CASE NO. 4:22-MJ-2398-07 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF, HOUSTON, TEXAS v. TRAVONTE ARDOIN,

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION/DETENTION HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE SAM S. SHELDON UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Appearances: (See next page)

DEFENDANT.

Appearances:

For the GOVERNMENT: LISA MARIE COLLINS, ESQ.

Assistant United States Attorney

Office of the United States

Attorney

1000 Louisiana, Suite 2300

HOUSTON, TX 77002

For DEFENDANT GOODLEY: ROBERT FICKMAN, ESQ.

440 Louisiana St., Suite 200

Houston, TX 77002

For DEFENDANT BROWN: BRETT A. PODOLSKY, ESQ.

Attorney at Law

917 Franklin Street, Suite 510

Houston, TX 77002

DEFENDANT TRAVONTE ARDOIN: MARC C. CARTER, ESQ.

Attorney at Law

1001 McKinney Street, Suite 1600

Houston, TX 77007

U.S. PROBATION: SERGIO SALINAS

UNITED STATES MARSHAL: MARTIN WHITE

Transcription Service: Cheryl L. Battaglia

Trinity Transcription Services

1081 Main Street

Surgoinsville, TN 37873

the factors that the Court is to consider under 3142, his

```
5
 1
    And the bulk of his family lives in Houston.
              THE COURT: So -- so -- so let me stop you,
 2
    Mr. Fickman.
 3
              Let me say this, the flight is not a concern of mine.
 4
 5
    So -- so first, I forgot to mention for you all. Because this
    is a double presumption case, there's only, you know, both on
 6
 7
    the -- the drugs and the guns.
              It's your burden, and to rebut that presumption. But
 8
 9
    my concern is a danger to the community and not flight risk, as
10
    to any of the Defendants.
              MR. FICKMAN: Oh, and -- and I -- and I will address
11
12
    that, your Honor.
13
              THE COURT: Okay.
14
              MR. FICKMAN: I was trying to give you a little bit
15
    of background of the matter.
16
              THE COURT: Okay. Sounds good.
17
              MR. FICKMAN: And I'll answer that, your Honor.
18
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
19
              MR. FICKMAN: Okay. And this -- the proffers are
20
    relatively short.
21
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
22
              MR. FICKMAN: She would testify, just in terms of his
23
    history, that he was a good student. In fact, when she was
24
    raising him when he was 11 years old, he participated in a
    national championship of -- that was here in Texas for chess
```

```
6
 1
    players.
              I have here Defense Exhibit Number 1 and Number 2.
 2
 3
    I've tendered a copy to the State.
                                We'll admit those.
 4
              THE COURT:
                         Okay.
 5
         (Goodley Exhibits Number 1 and 2 were received into
 6
    evidence.)
 7
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
                           What they show, your Honor, this is
 8
              MR. FICKMAN:
 9
    kind of remarkable, that is that for unrated players, when he
10
    was 11 years, cause that's 11 years ago, he's 22 now. He came
11
    in first in the national championship for sixth graders is the
12
    way I read it. And that's confirmed by his aunt in terms of
13
    her knowledge.
14
              So this is a young man of, I would say, above average
15
    intellect. She also confirmed that as he's coming through
16
    school, he want to magnate schools based on his grades. And he
17
    was an honor roll student.
18
              So this is an intelligent young man who, I -- I think
19
    it's -- it's important, it does go to dangerousness. Because I
20
    think he has the brain power. While he may say and do -- there
21
    may be some history of him saying and doing some foolish, and
22
    stupid, and potentially dangerous things, he's also an
23
    intelligent young man that has the intellect to comply with
24
    rules. At least has the -- the -- the intelligence to
25
    do that.
```

2.3

When he was 13, according to the criminal record, he got into a juvenile problem. I think he moved out of his aunt's house, was staying at his mother's house. And the supervision was not so good there.

When he was 14, according to his aunt, he moved back in with her. And at that time in the ninth grade, he was on the football team. He was a good student. He did not get in any trouble.

And then when he was 15, he returned living with his mother. And there if the Court looks at his record when he's 13 and then again when he's 15, he gets in trouble with the law. Both of those are periods where he's not living with the aunt, whose testimony I'm proffering.

So when he was in a supervised atmosphere, he did well. He abided by the rules and he actually excelled. When he was in a more of a unsupervised environment, he did not do well, as is evident by the record.

As in terms of dangerousness, I would argue and submit that -- that if the Court places him under stringent conditions, and electronic monitor, and things of that type, that he would not pose a danger to the community, especially if his aunt was involved in the conditions. Because with his aunt, he's always done well.

His -- he's 22 years old now. His aunt says she stayed in touch with him when he got out of on -- at the

beginning of this year. He got paroled. But at the beginning
of this year, he was -- he was released.

And he stayed in touch with his aunt. She said she conducts Sunday services at her house where she put together this ministry. He comes to her house every Sunday, either with his common law wife or by himself.

In this interim, he was actually term is baptized, but I guess born again. And she would act as in any capacity I think the Court would ask her to act in, in order to provide the Court assurances that he would not pose a danger to the community. In her personal opinion if she was involved in his life, she does not believe he would pose a danger to the community. Because in those times in his life that she was actively engaged with him in his life, he didn't pose a danger to the community. He excelled and did good things like winning the first place in 11-year old chess contest.

I would next kind of the testimony of -- of Micaela Koffman. She's 22. She's gainfully employed at Direct TV. She's attending Calvin (phonetic) Community College. She's also Reserve Active Duty in the Army National Guard. She's been in that for four years.

She is a -- she's a productive citizen, your Honor.

She's -- everything she's doing is positive and productive.

And she's also serving our country. She is the common law wife, girlfriend, depending on how one defines it, of Emery

Goodley.

They live together on XXXXXXX XXXXX. And they've been together since about 2019, prior to his going back into custody. Then they got back together when he was released earlier this year, his parole on that -- that case.

So he's stayed in jail for a couple years. Then he was released, and they got back together. They don't have any kids. She says that he works. Confirmed again family ties. In the past she confirms his work history as the Court has before it. And she confirms the rest of the information that I related to the Court in terms of his -- her knowledge of his history, since 15 and on. But said he was a quarterback in the 9th grade before he got in trouble when he was 15 apparently.

There's -- another thing is that when he was in jail, she would testify, to her knowledge he completed his GED. He got a welder's certificate. He worked on a power plant certificate. And he also attended Navarro College either in jail or when he got out, parttime.

She doesn't believe he has a drug or alcohol problem. She lives with him, your Honor. The fact that he doesn't appear to have a drug or alcohol problem I think would increase the likelihood that he could live among the rest of us and not pose a threat.

She does not believe that he would pose a danger to the community. And I understand that it's a high burden. Bu

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
these are the two people that know him best. In their opinion,
if they were involved in the conditions that were placed on
him, they would actively be involved. They agree to be --
actively be involved in his life. And, in fact, his common law
wife or girlfriend, said that she would act as a custodian.
          The Pretrial Service Report interviewed her and said
that she would qualify as, I think as, a, I don't know if it's
a custodian of -- that she would qualify in some capacity to be
involved with his bond. That she met the criteria.
don't have the report in front of me right now. But I think
the Court still has its copy.
          That's the proffer --
          THE COURT: Okay.
          MR. FICKMAN: -- argument.
     (Pause in the proceeding.)
          THE COURT: Let me -- Miss Collins, do you want to --
to you want to go first before the -- do you want them all to
present their proffers and then arguments differently? Or do
you -- what's the most efficient way for you?
          MS. COLLINS: Probably efficient for the Court would
be just one argument.
          THE COURT: Yeah. So why don't you make your
argument, Mr. Fickman.
          MR. FICKMAN:
                        Okay.
```

Your Honor, addressing the testimony from yesterday,

2.3

just highlighting the points made by the -- that came out through the agent's testimony and not the -- the -- going into graphic detail, but just the high points.

First, the information that was related to the Court today about the statement that was made. I saw this was a videotaped statement. There's an ongoing conversation between two agents and my client. This is a short blurb of the entire conversation. I have not had an opportunity to watch the entire tape. So I don't know the context.

The words that were related to you by the Government, I believe that's an accurate recitation of the words that were said in that moment. There is no -- well, one could interpret it, certainly, it's not a good thing to say. But one could interpret it as non-specific, not enough to the words spoken for the Government to take action like go file charges or something like that.

As I was pointing out when we were talking earlier that people say stupid things all the time that they don't actually mean.

My client said that -- that he was going to do all this time. He wasn't going to let anybody play with him. And he'd end up killing somebody. Well, that's in the context of perhaps him trying to act tough. I don't know.

But people say they're going to kill their boss all the time and they don't mean that. So I would ask the Court

not to put too much emphasis on those words.

As far as the actual evidence in this case, the agent testified that Mr. Goodley was not under investigation when this case began. There was no Title 3 on his phone. He was not a member of Free Money. That his voice did not appear on any Title 3 wiretap. And I think were, I believe the agent said there were a number of wiretaps in this case. I can't remember the number. I thought it was four or five. I stand corrected whatever the number was. But his -- his voice had not been identified on any of those wiretaps.

There was a firearm recovered in the vehicle, but the agent testified that my client was never observed to be in possession of a firearm. When my client was observed coming out of that house that supposedly the meeting was at, my client was observed, but was not -- without a gun in his possession.

The vehicle was driving and a gun was seen thrown out of the vehicle from the backseat is what the agent said. So he did not believe that that was done by my client.

At the time he was arrested, that is, my client, he didn't run, fight, or resist. He was, obviously, somewhat surrounded. So he didn't probably have much opportunity to do any of those things.

But there are people that will run, fight, and resist even if they're surrounded. He didn't do any of that. And, in fact, he agreed to sit down and talk to the agents, which

```
clearly he did, and which probably was -- I point out was uncounseled, which I think is -- is important. And I'm not saying they tricked him. I'm just saying that that's -- that's a factor for the Court's consideration.

In conclusion, I think that a conditions of release
```

can be fashioned. This is a unique young man who is operating -- who has the intellectual ability to understand and comply. I don't think that because a person maybe has a higher IQ and can do well in a chess match should -- should -- they should be treated differently.

I'm simply trying to indicate that this is not a guy that's an idiot. This is a smart young man who finds himself in a bad place. But I think if he has rules to follow, that he would understand the rules. And based on the representations of his family members, I believe that he would follow those rules.

Now I understand that there's -- there's the presumption is hard to beat and hard to overcome. I submit that in this case that this is a young man that the Court could take a chance with.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Fickman.

Mr. Carter?

(Pause in the proceeding.)

(Voices speaking off the record.)

MR. CARTER: Thank you, your Honor.

2.3

First off, I have a couple of proffers. My proffers were from the -- the parents. And I -- and there was actually another one, the girlfriend, and I don't -- I'm not sure if I informed them yet, the Government, about that yesterday. But the proffers are very similar. They are not here. They were here yesterday. But they're working today.

The first proffer would be from Demetria (phonetic)

Ardoin, the mother. She works for Harris Health Systems. And she would sign on any -- any bond or any conditions that you were to give the Defendant in this case, if he were to be granted a bond.

The girlfriend is Dasja, D-a-s-j-a, Peters

(phonetic), also known as Daisy. She works for security at

Allied -- it's -- it's -- I'm not sure, but it's -- the

company's Allied. I can't ready my -- my -- Allied Universal

is what I believe it says. But that is the company where she

does security. And she's been there for five years. And she

said she would also be willing to sign on any kind of bond.

And the father, similar.

Now, again, the -- the presumption is that there is no conditions that would guarantee the safety of the community. And so the presumption is that my client has to go to jail while this is pending.

But as I offered yesterday, is I think that that presumption is overcome because my client has been on -- on

1 community -- well, he's been on 24-hour house arrest on bond in 2 State Court the same -- same offense back on 8/14/2022.

All right. So he has been on bond. And while he's been on bond, there have not been any violations from that Court. Now, to the Government's going to maybe argue that there's some violations. But that Court has not -- has not done anything, any -- any violations, be called into court for anything. And, in fact, they say he made all his court appearances. He's done everything that he's supposed to do.

But I'll -- I'll get to some of these other matters. So in that, he's on a 24-hour house arrest. So he can't leave the home. He lives in the home with his mother, his brother Terry, his co-Defendant, does not live there. So I think that's important for the Court to -- to recognize.

(Pause in the proceeding.)

2.3

MR. CARTER: His -- he has no prior history. No -- no record. No criminal history.

He possessed a license to carry. And that's why
he -- and with that license to carry, he had legally purchased
that -- that weapon that was at his home. And it should be
noted that he was truthful with Pretrial Services when they
asked him, do you have weapons. And he said, "Yes."

Now the -- the circumstances in a State Court bond are very, very different. They -- you're in the courtroom.

You appear. And the Judge says these are the things. And

then, you know, there's a laundry list, right?

But there's never any -- any question hey, you know, do you have a weapon? You need to surrender it. Give it to this person. Doesn't happen in State Court.

So he had a -- he had a gun. He had it. He had possessed it lawfully. And then when asked about it, he surrendered. He informed the -- the Government and it was surrendered.

(Pause in the proceeding.)

MR. CARTER: Now, there's other interesting things.

He was not -- he's not a gang member. There's no social media connecting him to this event. There's no wiretaps or intercepts connecting him to this event.

There is, of course, you know, the elephant in the room is extraneous that the -- that the Government had brought before the Court. And -- and, of course, you know, I understand the concern. But there -- there's also the fact that, you know, he hasn't been charged.

And the last time I checked, he's got a presumption of innocence. Especially in an event where he's not even been charged. So, I think that based on his presumption of innocence, he should not be held — that should not be held against him. And he has not been charged, as well as, the fact that he has no prior criminal history. He's been on bond in State Court. And he's been compliant.

previous year as in construction.

2.3

And just getting to the facts, cause, obviously, this is a complaint. So probable cause is an issue. I'll start with the -- the proffer.

As pointed out -- and -- and obviously we were at a bit of disadvantage yesterday. Because we were handed, you know, several reports during the hearing. And -- and while the Court did give us time, you know, the -- to attempt to review those, it was just not possible to marshal all those facts in such a short period of time. But -- but going with what we did go over, the proffer makes a lot of conclusory statements.

Obviously, there was that issue regarding Mr. Brown being the driver of that vehicle, the black Alantra, where the -- the -- the Glock 19's with the automatic switches were found, which made the basis of those -- of that particular charge that, as the Court pointed out, carries the 30-year minimum sentence.

So, let's talk about that, cause I really -- cause that is an important issue as far as probable cause.

(Pause in the proceeding.)

MR. PODOLSKY: According to the -- there was nothing -- no mention, anything about any surveillance of my client getting in that Alantra, or getting out of that Alantra, the black Alantra, or being anywhere near that Alantra within this proffer.

And when pointed out to the -- the -- or the

detective in this case, then there was some testimony, well I saw it on some surveillance. Of course, which has never been further explored or offered by the Government.

And it -- it seems --

THE COURT: But -- but let me -- let me stop you.

So let me -- let me just say this to -- to everybody before I give you my critique of that, that the one thing I like about the federal system is the CJA Panel. And -- and I don't -- and hopefully the Defendants will appreciate like how lucky they are to have the three of you and they're facing these serious charges.

I think the three of you have done an excellent job. And they're getting you for free. Where the great thing about the federal system is -- is you all, you can't even get on the CJA panel unless you're experienced and you have private clients that you charge thousands of dollars. And that's -- that's the good thing about the Defendants in this case is they're all in good hands.

And you faced a Herculean task yesterday of getting all this and proceeding with the hearing and not knowing where you're at. But the Government's in the same position as far as to me this proffer. I mean, they're putting together this proffer. And they're doing it at my request as quick as possible.

And you -- you have the agent. And -- and I can't

expect him to put or sorry, the detective, everything that he knows. He's putting these things in conclusory fashion so he can then be cross examined by you. And -- and we're at just the beginning of this case, you know.

It's not like we're at trial and he's putting together this as a trial exhibit. And to be honest, what I was telling the folks this morning, you know, normally the Government, and I've been a former prosecutor, they put up a witness that knows the least about the case because they're afraid of that person being cross examined and making admissions that are going to hurt them at trial.

And here they -- they put up Detective Bock. And in my experience, you know, he -- he knows a lot about this case. And he was more credible than, not to say that the other people aren't credible, they just don't know anything. And he knows a lot.

And so the -- the question is, to me, not what he put in there. It's whether, you know, we believe what he's saying's true, right? So he's saying that the basis of -- and I get your position is, is that the people on the ground that were conducting the surveillance only saw three. They didn't see four.

And he's saying cause that's all they saw. But then we have the -- the -- the plane in the air and the helicopter that's saying that there's video showing the four. But more

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 importantly, he's also saying there's a call from your client afterwards saying that he was the driver.

And so if you're asking me -- there's -- there's two issues. One, yes, you're kind of being, not intentionally, but you're getting ambushed because it's not in the report. the question is, is, you know, is it true. And as we sit here today and me making a probable cause finding, I don't know how else -- how other I'd make that finding, based on the fact that he's saying that there's video surveillance. And more importantly, your client's own admission as to being the driver.

MR. PODOLSKY: Well, and Judge, I'm not -- what I understand this admission was, which was a surveillance of him saying I just wrecked the Stollo (phonetic).

> THE COURT: Right.

MR. PODOLSKY: Which car that is, I mean, I don't know if that was established. But that's the line that I heard into evidence yesterday.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. PODOLSKY: Now obviously, you -- the Court will and should make reasonable inferences from that.

> THE COURT: Right.

MR. PODOLSKY: I -- I get that.

THE COURT: Right.

25 But -- but ultimately, I have to do it for the sake

- 22 1 of probable cause in determining the strength of the case. 2 But -- but my opinion really doesn't matter. It's really what 3 12 jurors, if this case is going to go to trial, you know, what is common sense and reason tell them. Does that statement mean 4 5 that he was driving some other vehicle at some other place, or 6 the vehicle in question in this case, you know. 7 And so if you ask me, I'd say -- and I haven't heard 8 this. I'm just basing this on what the detective is saying is, 9 is, you know, my -- my reasonable inference is he's talking 10 about this vehicle. 11 MR. PODOLSKY: And -- and my only response, Judge, 12 and I -- I completely understand where the Court's coming from, 13 is that this didn't happen October 14th. This happened August 14 14th. 15 They've had more than two months in preparation for
 - this complaint, for these arrests, for this hearing. I mean --
- 17 THE COURT: Okay. But -- but on this --
- 18 MR. PODOLSKY: -- cause everyone --

20

22

23

24

- 19 THE COURT: -- but on this proffer.
- So the way I do things is I -- they only had whenever 21 to put together that proffer a short amount of time.

And so, the question is, is what should he put in that -- what should he put in that proffer, and to me I can't really take, I mean, he's putting what -- he's putting there -he's putting the -- what he thinks the conclusion is.

- and your, you know, your position is he should have put more of the basis for that conclusions.

 And so --
- 4 MR. PODOLSKY: Or at least presented the Court with,
 5 you know, evidence, you know, to support that conclusion.
 - I under -- because it -- it's different than if this was an indictment. If this was an indictment --
- 8 **THE COURT:** Right.

7

18

19

20

21

22

23

- 9 MR. PODOLSKY: -- you know, there's no probable

 10 cause. It is what it is. And it's really just about danger to

 11 the community and -- and -- and flight risk.
- But it is a complaint. And so, you know, they do

 have to meet, you know, a -- a probable cause standard. And

 that's -- that's why I'm --
- 15 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 16 MR. PODOLSKY: -- I'm bringing is to the Court's attention.
 - The -- the -- the Court heard the evidence that they never saw Mr. Brown with the gun. They never saw Mr. Brown exchanging guns as they did other Defendants that day. And out in front of the XXXXXX address.
 - They never saw him handling a gun or -- or exchanging guns. They never saw him with a gun inside the vehicle. Or

 I -- I imagine if they had -- if their surveillance is as good as able to identify him, that, you know, they didn't mention

```
24
 1
    anything about his holding a gun as he was running away after
 2
    wreck if, in fact, he was there.
 3
              They never saw him get in the vehicle, or arrive in
                  There was no evidence that he was associated with
 4
    the vehicle.
 5
    driving that vehicle any time prior. And apparently, they had
 6
    been watching that house and him for several months prior to
 7
    this happening.
              That's, you know, those are all -- and certainly,
 8
 9
    those are going to be issues that we will, I'm sure, hash out
10
    down the road. But for purposes of today, and for purposes of
11
    the decision that Court has to make, I would be remiss if I
12
    didn't point that out.
```

THE COURT: And I don't want you to think any -- what I'm saying is not a critique of you. It's that --

MR. PODOLSKY: I -- I don't.

THE COURT: Right. okay.

MR. PODOLSKY: I just --

THE COURT: I want that to be clear. I'm not critiquing you. You're doing the best you can with the evidence you have. And you're making all the arguments I'd be making if I was standing where you are.

MR. PODOLSKY: I appreciate that.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. PODOLSKY: And -- and, you know, all of here

25 | are -- have been --

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

```
1
              THE COURT: I mean, you have a really difficult job.
 2
    And so I don't want anything I say, I -- I know how difficult
 3
    your job is. And you're taking --
 4
              MR. PODOLSKY: I -- I get it, Judge.
 5
              THE COURT: -- this appointment.
 6
              MR. PODOLSKY: I'm not taking this --
 7
              THE COURT: Okay.
              MR. PODOLSKY: -- as a critique of my work.
 8
 9
              What I -- what I do understand is that, given the
10
    nature of the charges, that certainly the -- the particular
11
    background of each -- each Defendant, particularly in my case,
12
    Mr. Brown, it's a -- it's a hurdle, a -- a rather high one.
13
    And I get that.
14
         (Pause in the proceeding.)
15
              MR. PODOLSKY: The -- I would just also like to point
16
    out, I mean, obviously, they've had over two months prior to
17
    come in today. There's been no representation of any forensic
18
    evidence, even fingerprints. Those can be returned within
19
    days.
20
              I know, we all know, as anybody that's been a defense
21
    or a -- certainly a prosecutor know that DNA evidence can come
22
    back expedited if need be. None of that has been presented to
23
    the Court to link my client to any of the guns or even inside
24
    that vehicle.
25
              And -- and, Judge, so that -- that's my position as
```

far as probable cause on the -- the gun case. As -- and as you heard from the testimony from the detective, that he was not a participant in any of the phone calls or messages that specifically talked about hitting a lick, or 10P, or 3 automatics, or anything of that nature. He was not a party to those conversations, according to the Government's evidence.

And that that address where they met at, they all -these same Free Money individuals would go there to do rap
videos and to perform. And that was -- they had witnessed that
themselves. And as I understand the testimony from social
media, they knew that that had happened on other occasions as
well.

There was some talk -- now with regard to the drugs.

As I understand it, the -- a -- a search was done of the drugs last Friday, if -- and I think I'm correct on that when they executed the warrants on this case.

And my client apparently, according to the testimony, had been in that house prior to the execution of the warrant, was not present when the warrant was executed. And were there two other individuals, one on parole, the other one with criminal history. Two males were inside that -- that home.

And that -- and then there were drug -- there were a hundred grams of drugs, of cocaine found. That's what the Court was told as far as that day and that arrest. There was no information about any particular links to that drug, what

individuals that, I guess were released and not charged, even

though they were in the home with -- I mean, if you're there with the drugs and you don't get charged, what does that say about the guy that wasn't there?

THE COURT: Well, I don't -- I mean, there could be other reasons why there's not charging.

MR. PODOLSKY: And it certainly could.

THE COURT: Right.

2.3

MR. PODOLSKY: But -- or there wasn't any evidence that those two individuals were part of the Free Money Gang, or associated, or how they may or may not have been associated with Mr. Brown. None of that was brought to the Court's attention.

And if they made the strategic decision to not provide that today for whatever reasons, well, you know, I mean that's the decision that the Government made. And -- and once again, there's still a probable cause standard.

And, Judge, I would -- and I guess in -- in summation, I would say that, Judge, stepping away from the flight risk, and the links to community, and all that, I recognize that he has some criminal history, most, as far as I can tell of note particularly, and I know the Court has this report in front of them.

(Pause in the proceeding.)

MR. PODOLSKY: A robbery from 2012 when he was 17.

The other ones, there's -- there's some other what I would

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 29 consider more minor offenses, a credit card abuse case, that may have been pled down if he got one year state jail, or I'm -- I'm not sure how that was pled out. But I think credit card abuse in State Court is a third degree. And he was given state jail. So they had to have pled that down. And then I know that the unlawful use of a criminal instrument was reduced as well. And then I guess he's got an unlawful possession of a firearm by a felon pending in Galveston County. Judge, I would ask the Court just consider the evidence that's -- that the Government to provide the Court today knowing that this was still a complaint. I would ask the Court consider release of my client pending trial. I understand the presumptions. But from a fact standpoint, a probable cause standpoint, I -- I would -- I would think that the Court could fashion a -- a set of restrictions and set of bond conditions that could protect the community and insure his presence throughout these -- this process, Judge. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Miss Collins? MS. COLLINS: Yes, your Honor. Do you wish for me to argue probable cause or
 - THE COURT: Both.

strictly detention?

MS. COLLINS: Yes, your Honor.

2 THE COURT: Just respond then to Mr. Podolsky's

3 points.

1

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. COLLINS: Absolutely, your Honor.

5 There -- couple of corrections I want to make from 6 what Mr. Podolsky stated.

THE COURT: Can you make sure you're under a microphone so everyone can hear.

MS. COLLINS: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Okay.

(Pause in the proceeding.)

MS. COLLINS: Starting with the fact that Markel Brown was, In fact, on several calls, at least two that I can think of off the top of my head that are -- are included in the proffer where he is speaking on the phone, which is intercepted, to the others involved talking about not just the job, but that he is part of the crew that is recruiting others to participate in that job, which makes sense as a member of Free Money who lives at that location and is over that -- that territory, if you will.

Furthermore, as you've heard, I -- I think the evidence is, in fact, clear about the fact that he was in a vehicle, the driver of the vehicle, with the individuals who he has recruited who have three Glock switches in that vehicle at least that we know of, along with whatever he escaped with as

he was not arrested that night.

And I would argue, your Honor, that whether or not he himself held a gun, this is a conspiracy case. And as an individual who on the phone calls is admitting to recruiting those involved, whether or not he held a firearm with a Glock switch or not, is a moot point I would argue to the Court.

Because as a party to this conspiracy, he is, in fact, taking control of that conspiracy, along with Jcoi Barley and Terry Ardoin.

And so, I would submit to the Court that it doesn't really matter whether or not he is -- is one of the men actually holding the gun. He is the one putting those men in the car to have those guns in the first place.

Furthermore, as you've heard, the Defendant himself, Markel Brown, stated he was the driver of the Stollo that just crashed out. I know that the Court has read the proffer fully, which states that that black Equinox was a stolen vehicle.

That is, in fact, why it was pulled over that night, or -- or stopped on traffic.

And so it's clear that the only Stollo there is the one in which he is seen fleeing from and therefore confesses to.

I believe that covers Mr. Podlosky's points, unless you have -- the Court had any questions for me.

THE COURT: Yes. He -- he was making the point about

tying the drugs to the conspiracy.

MS. COLLINS: Well --

THE COURT: If the drugs are found in October, how are they related to the conspiracy in August.

MS. COLLINS: And -- and I -- I would submit that they're two different issues.

Ultimately, the -- the August $14^{\rm th}$ conspiracy with regard to drugs, was to steal the drugs from Ratchet (phonetic) Man as they make clear on the phone calls.

The conspiracy is to steal those drugs, which they state are pounds of drugs from Ratchet Man to then sell and make a profit off of, separate and apart from the drugs that are then found in his home upon the execution of the search warrant.

But moreover, I would submit that that is simply a detention issue. Has nothing to do with the elements of the -the underlying complaint offenses. And I would also submit to the Court that as we've heard from Detective Bock, there are, I believe he said, approximately 50 separate phone calls in which Markel Brown is discussing the sale of drugs.

Furthermore, he stated that they had surveillance on XXXXXX, the place that he was living and residing, where drug transactions were occurring. So, I -- I think it's minding words, if you will, whether or not that particular -- the drugs found that day were his or not.

I would submit to the Court that either way he is while on bond participating in the sale of drugs, which is a law violation, which is clearly against the bond conditions that he's been given.

THE COURT: Okay. Move on to the -- to detention as to each of them.

MS. COLLINS: Yes, your Honor.

First, again, with regard to Markel Brown. Defense counsel mentioned that he was very young at the time that he received that first aggravated robbery. And I would suggest that that is, in fact, why he was given an opportunity in the form of an eight-year probation, which he then violated. And, therefore, was sentenced to five TDC.

And not -- less than six years -- about five years later, he's once again facing another felony offense for which he receives a year of state jail. And then a year later is, again, in felony court with another year of state jail. And then he has the felon in possession, for which he's on bond for and has been continuously on bond since January of 2022, while he is talking about selling drugs on wire intercepts, as well as committing the events of August 14th.

So I think his actions speak for himself. That he doesn't care about the conditions that he's given, and will not follow those conditions, whether it's State Court of Federal Court, your Honor.

2.3

As to Trevonte Ardoin. Again, I submit that all of the families of these men love them, and care about them, and would do everything they could for them. And I believe that they have, and that they have family members who are, in fact, a part of their lives. And, unfortunately, just have not been able to restrain these Defendants and prevent them from committing criminal activity.

Trevonte himself states that he's been living at XXXXXX XXXX where his parents live. And unfortunately, they -- they haven't been able to hamper his activities. And I don't believe that there's any evidence that that would change if he were released today.

Obviously, the issue becomes the fact that he is also on bond. Putting that 45 Glock that's found at his house aside, we've heard testimony that there are intercepts after he makes bond, after he is told he is not allowed to possess firearms, where he is looking actively for a replacement firearm, a replacement rifle. So again, violating the conditions that he's been given.

And then on top of that, obviously, the fact that we've heard testimony and in the form of the proffer that the -- that Detective Bock watched the video surveillance of the homicide that was committed, was able to ID Travonte and Terry Ardoin by name and sight as the individuals committing that homicide. And I just -- there's obviously no greater

criminal enterprise than that.

Finally, as to Emery Goodley. This is -- I would submit to the Court we don't often see someone who has -- has all the opportunities, is given all the chances in life, has the smarts to accomplish great things in life. And yet, as he has made clear by his own admissions in his statement, the life he has chosen is one of a gang lifestyle.

He stated, you know, I should be locked up. If released, I will just do more of the same. He has told this Court exactly how he will behave.

Furthermore, when we look at his background, at the age of 15, he's certified I --as -- as -- as an adult. And I think that that speaks volumes to the fact that he is already acting in such a way that the Harris County criminal sentence would be that of an adult and given five years -- six years in TDC for the aggravated robbery that he committed.

He has literally barely been out in 2019 when he is committing an assault for which he receives 90 days. And then I would point out that the carrying a weapons charge that he received, should have been a felon in possession. It should have been a felony offense as he is a felon in both the state and federal systems.

And yet, he is again just doing what he wants, along with the activities that occurred on August $14^{\rm th}$ of this year.

(Pause in the proceeding.)

MS. COLLINS: And again, defense counsel pointed out the fact that no one saw him possessing a firearm in his hand at the time that he leaves the residence at XXXXXXX.

But we've heard testimony that he is gloving up.

He's putting a mask on. He clearly knows what he is about to
go do. And furthermore, when they find him, and get him out of
his seat, in plain view is a Mack (phonetic) Ten rifle right
next to where he's sitting.

He was in a position, despite being given every opportunity, ready to go, smash in a door, and kill someone if necessary. That's the lifestyle he's chosen.

And because of that, I would argue that all three of these men are a threat and danger to the community. And that there is no condition or combination of conditions that can insure the safety of the citizenry.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CARTER: Just --

THE COURT: Sure go ahead.

MR. CARTER: If I may, your Honor. I believe she misspoke.

Because she stated that basically having a conversation about a weapon is a violation of bond. And it is not. It might be something that concerns you, but the record should be clear that that's not a violation of bond or its conditions.

THE COURT: Well let me just say. I mean, I -- I don't want to get too far in the weeds.

But my understanding is she's saying that he's talking on wiretaps after he was placed on the August bond of purchasing other firearms. And so you're saying that that wouldn't be -- if his -- cause -- cause I'm looking at his conditions from the August 14, 2022 is that, "Defendant must not use or possess a firearm."

MR. CARTER: Correct. And so I'm saying having a conversation about firearm is not a violation of those conditions.

THE COURT: But what if he's talking about -- and -- and you would know more, cause you dealt with this for many years.

But I'm saying, let's just say hypothetically, cause
I don't listen to these tapes, that he's talking about
purchasing other firearms, or using other firearms, that's what
I understood Miss Collins to be representing that -- would that
be a -- a violation of is bond.

Not just casual conversations about guns, but actually going out and purchasing other guns to replace a gun that was seized, would that be a violation?

MR. CARTER: I personally do not believe that's a violation. But I'm not saying that that's not a concern of the Court.

that didn't happen. He surrendered.

Okay.

THE COURT:

23

24

MR. FICKMAN: Anything can happen in this world, but

THE COURT: Okay.

2.3

2 MR. FICKMAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. PODOLSKY: Judge, as -- for what it's worth, I -- I believe Miss Collins testified that -- that Mr. Brown was part of conversations, text messages, or social media indicating the commission of a crime.

As I recall the testimony, I asked the detective specifically about that. That, and my understanding is, that the answer was he -- he was not part of the conversations they were discussing criminality. But just in general about a meeting this afternoon, everyone needs to be there. But it wasn't -- there were no specifics about what that meeting was for, or what they were going to do when they got there, or what they were planning.

He was not a part of those conversations -- those conversations where they were talking about Ratchet Man, hitting a lick, 10P, 3 automatics. Those were with other of the co-conspirators, alleged co-conspirators.

And as I understand the testimony, and I could be incorrect, but as I heard the testimony that the detective testified that he -- Mr. Brown was not part of those conversations or included in those messages.

You know, that's -- that's my position, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

40 1 MS. COLLINS: I believe the proffer speaks for 2 itself. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 So, I -- I'm going to repeat what I said this 5 morning. And I -- and I apologize for the folks that are here 6 and -- and hear the same thing I'm going to say this morning. 7 But these decisions are never easy for a Magistrate 8 Judge. Deciding bond is probably one of the most -- probably 9 one of the most difficult decisions that we have to make, 10 determining whether someone remains in custody or they're 11 released on bond. 12 After today I won't have any other involvement in 13 your case. Your case will probably go to a Grand Jury. And 14 then it's assigned to a District Judge. And so my only job 15 today is -- is to find, you know, determine probable cause and 16 then decide the bond issue. 17 As to probable cause, I do believe that the 18 Government has proven probable cause as to each of the 19 Defendants here. But -- but understand that just because I'm 20 finding probable cause it -- it's really meaningless in the 21 sense that at this stage, there's really no rules of evidence. 22 Hearsay's allowed. I'm making a determination whether it's 2.3 based on a reasonableness.

Versus at trial, there's strict rules of evidence.

The -- the standard of proof is beyond a reasonable doubt. And

24

25

2.3

it's 12 people making that decision. So just because I found probable cause doesn't necessarily meant that -- that all four of you are guilty of the crime.

Now as to the bond, you know, I can tell you my decision. But -- but I think, and I'll give you a one minute of, you know, the lens that I look at these cases is that, you know, I've been practicing law for 25 years.

Before I became a judge, my career was evenly divided between civil and criminal. But between the criminal it was half as a prosecutor and half as a defense attorney. But other than being married and having three kids, my proudest accomplishment in life is I represented pro bono six federal defendants that were serving life sentences who are now free.

And so when I was doing that work, I spent hundreds of hours in federal prison. And I -- and I spent time with folks like you. But I saw them on the back end after they already served 20 or 30 years.

And -- and for all these people, the same arguments that Miss Collins made were -- were right at that time. But I saw people make tremendous changes where when they served this amount of time, they had zero infractions. And they -- they just did incredible things in federal prison to merit getting a second chance and convincing people.

And so it -- it's not easy when we look at -- when we look at you, Mr. Goodley, that -- like to play chess, like I

could never play chess cause I'm not smart enough to play those moves, or even understand the game.

And so it's -- it's tremendous sadness. It's there for you, you know, that -- that -- that deep down it's there that -- that you have that intelligence. And it's just going to be -- it's just going to be your choice going forward what -- what you want to do in life.

But -- but you have that ability. And -- and I don't ever give up on people, you know. But -- but it's -- but you and -- and everybody else are going to have to make that decision of -- of what you want to -- what you want to be in life. Cause it -- it's just not worth what we're seeing here.

And -- and as I said before, what the detective's testimony, I mean, to me, this is a pretty strong case. You know, you -- you all are going to decide what you want to do. And the great thing about the Constitution is you have that right to go to trial and let 12 people decide.

But me just sitting here looking at this case, just as quickly as your attorneys, that it's not every day in every case that we have wiretaps, and we have pole cams, and we have airplanes and helicopters.

That's just uncommon. It just makes their job a lot harder at -- at -- at trial. And the stakes in these cases are so high because, like with Mr. Podlosky's client, I mean, just the -- the machine gun. We're not even talking about the drugs

or other stuff, 30-year mandatory minimum.

This isn't a state case. If you're convicted of that charge, you're going to do 85 percent of that time. That -that's a minimum of, I'm not a math major. That's why I went into law school. But I think it's about 24 years in prison or more. And that's a lot of time.

And that's the time that you're all -- you're all facing in this case. It's just, you know, between the 924(c), the gun, and the mandatory minimum on drugs, it's a lot of time. But as I said before, I don't give up on people. And you have the ability to -- to make that change.

But I, you know, me sitting here, and reviewing this, and looking at all the reports, I -- I don't believe any of the Defendant have -- have overcome that presumption because of the -- the seriousness of the case that we're talking about, just this case.

And then -- and I know that he hasn't been charged as far as Mr. Ardoin. But, I mean, we have a detective testifying that he -- that there was a shootout and someone was shot. And he's seen the video. And Mr. Ardoin's going to the hospital after he was shot in the shootout that to me the evidence is -- is pretty strong in -- in this case as to what was going on.

And then you combine that with the -- the criminal histories. And as Miss Collins says, you know, your families love you and -- and as Mr. Fickman got up and -- and the people

```
44
 1
    that he's addressing are all strong characters. But the case
 2
    isn't -- the case isn't against your family and how strong
 3
    character are. It's about you all.
 4
              And so, again, you know, it's not easy me telling you
 5
    you're going to be detained. But I -- I felt like by telling
 6
    you this that there's some explanation on my part.
 7
              So again, I find the Government's shown probable
 8
    cause. And as to the three Defendants, the presumption has not
 9
    been met.
10
              Let me start with Judge Carter. Anything else I need
11
    to address?
12
              MR. CARTER: No, your Honor.
13
              THE COURT: Okay.
14
              MR. CARTER: Thank you for your patience.
15
              THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Podolsky?
16
              MR. PODOLSKY: No, sir.
17
              THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Fickman?
18
              MR. FICKMAN:
                           No, sir. No, your Honor.
19
              THE COURT: And Miss Collins.
20
              MS. COLLINS: No, your Honor.
21
              THE COURT: Okay. Thank you all.
22
              Good luck, gentlemen.
23
         This proceeding was adjourned at 02:28 p.m.)
24
25
```

45 1 2 CERTIFICATION I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the 3 electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-4 5 entitled matter. /s/Cheryl L. Battaglia _____April 4, 2023 6 7 Transcriber Date 8 4:22-CR-577-8 9 10/27/22 - 04/04/23